

Scoring Rubrics for Arts Stabilization Grants

The following descriptors are designed to guide panelists in their discussion and ranking of Arts Stabilization applications. These descriptors elaborate on the Evaluation Criteria, as outlined in the *Arts Stabilization Application Guidelines*.

Evaluation Criteria	Need for the Project (30% of score)	Nature of Project (40% of score)	Financial Information (20% of score)	Facilities Planning (10% of score)
Exemplary (5 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a critical (“urgent”) need for the organization, using descriptive or photographic documentation • Proposed scope of work clearly addresses the problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project addresses critical building issues such as structure, safety, or accessibility could be compromised by failure to address the issue (These examples represent high-priority projects) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget/bids present a realistic and detailed account of anticipated expenses, and includes multiple matching income sources • Bids are comparable in scope • Bid selection is clearly supported in the narrative and includes warranty or guarantee Bids clearly align with the scope of work described in the narrative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization presents the proposal in the context of a board-approved long-range plan for facilities maintenance, depreciation, and the ongoing need to replace equipment
Exceeds Expectations (4 pts)	↑	↑	↑	↑
Meets Expectations (3 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates the need for the project with descriptive or photographic documentation, but urgency is not as compelling • Proposed scope of work adequately addresses the problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project addresses facility improvement such as HVAC, ADA-compliance, safety, accessibility (These examples represent medium-priority projects) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget/bids present realistic account of expenses and limited matching income • Bids are comparable in scope • Bid selection is generally supported in the narrative and includes warranty or guarantee • Bids generally align with the scope of work described in the narrative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization presents the project in the context of capital and facility needs, with limited evidence of long-range facilities planning
Needs Improvement (2 pts)	↑	↑	↑	↑
Deficient (1 pt)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of evidence of a need for the project • Proposed scope of work doesn’t align with or adequately present a solution to the problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project primarily represents enhancing program delivery through upgrades such as lighting, sound, audience comfort (These examples represent lower-priority projects) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget/bids do not present adequate information about expenses or matching income sources • Bids are comparable in scope • Bid selection is not adequately supported in the narrative and/or does not include warranty/guarantee • Bids don’t align with the scope of work described in the narrative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization presents the proposal as an isolated project, without evidence of long-range facilities planning